App. F. IX-4

192

File No. 73-4

Previous References Law

Serial Nos. 1 - 1

Later References P

Preserved

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Serial Nos. Two

Part B for Jan 1929

SUBJECT

Repeal of Regulation XI of 1827 so far as it relates to the Collectorate of Ganjam, Vizagapatam & Godavari

G. R. S [II—1] 1912[illegible].

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(Jl—)

NOTES.

File No.

FILE HEADING

Regular Suit by one Mr Rajagopala Setti for possession of 7/9 in Share of 2 bungalows of Mr Gundu Setty brought by Govt

From The D-le. Hassan Dt

No. 623-16 Dated 4.12.25 Received 7.12.25

Diary No. 2981 Enclos. — Spare Copies. — Serial No. 1

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER.

States that as the D-le. Hassan who has bought the two bungalows in revenue Sale for Govt dues, he has been made a party to the Suit which is for possession of 7/9 in portions of the property & for perpetual and Mesne and requests that the Public Prosecutor, may be instructed to defend the Suit in the mysore Dt-le.

NOTES AND ORDERS.

Subd for orders. with a draft of the P.P was ordered to defend represent the D-le in the mys. Suit which

NOTES—First Sheet.

J. R. S. III-2]

2-5-81

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 225 of 1917-25

Serial No.	
	was dismissed WR 8-12-25 This has to be dealt with in the pro. Pox. as a Suit has been filed. Pfr for add a other accn—
	RSW Jt. Member " L. Lees WP 8/12 8/12 WP 9/12 WP 11/12 3/12/25
	Issue 14/12 WP 14/12
3	To The D.C. Hassan Copy of Lr. Complr & Govt Public Prosecutor Mysore Dist Nos. C. 604-4 of 1917 Sanction in prosecution case in Secy
4	From the D.C. Hassan No. 623-16 Dt 9-12-25 Requests an advance of Rs 25/- for incidental expenses of the

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

Serial No

public Prosecutor in the Suit

draft Suit

17.12.25

Fu appl.

19/12

1st. member

19/12

21/12

516/21.12

Issue

22.12.25

4 To

The Collector of [illegible]

No. T. 4213 of 22/12

In Continuation of [illegible] Request

him to advance a sum of Rs 25/-

to the public Prosecutor [illegible]

Station towards the incidental charge

To

The Dy. Tahsildar

No. T. 4214 of 22/12

with Reference to (2) [illegible] copy of above

To The public Prosecutor

No. T. 4215 of 22/12

20 copy of 41

NOTE—Contn. Sheet

[App. F. III—2

General and Revenue Secretariat

3487

Fl File No. 225— of 192 5

Serial No. 5

Inward

From the Dy. Hassan Dt
No. 623-26 dt 5-1-26

Forwards for approval & return draft written statement to be filed in ~~R.S. No.~~ O.S. No 6 of 25-26 before the Dt. Judge Mysore

Subd with reference to Rev. orders on the P.U.R. The Plaintiff in rent L.d. Suit & Town of Hassan

MR 8.1.26 VS RSec 9/1/26 MP

To L.D. Secy with compliments & return

9.1.26

MP

It is best to ask the P.P^r to re-write the W.S in the light of D^t C's remarks re attachment instead of forfeiture & to consider the question of the effect of prior attachment by Rev authorities before the Judicial Sale in execution of the decree

In this connection the question has to be considered whether Rev. authorities have power to attach the properties before Sale of properties under Sec 161 of the Rev. Code to realize the arrears due to Govt & if they have no power, what is the effect of ~~no~~ improper attachment. The P. P^r who has records with him may study these questions & prepare a W.S. which will be countersigned later

NOTE—Contn. Sheet

Serial No

Submitted with draft
Sd
15.1.26

Draft approved by Secy for issue
Sd
15.1.26

Sd
16.1.26 To the Public Prosecutor No 3280 dt. 15.1.26. Returns the draft written statement for revision on the lines indicated & for transmission

From the Public Prosecutor No 296 dt. 22.1.26. States for reasons explained the written statement may remain as drafted with the addition made

The W. S. as drafted may be adopted
Sd
26/1.

Submitted with draft
Sd
26.1.26

app
To the Public Prosecutor Sd 26/1
No P 3657 dt Mysore 26.1.26.
States that the written statement as drafted by him may be adopted & filed.
To Redy Comm Kodagu Sd
No P 3658 dt 26.1.26
Sd a copy of the above and requests that typed copies duly certified may be sent to the Public Prosecutor Mysore soon for being filed in Court.

NOTE:— Contn. Sheet

31514 3042 P 25

D 34

Ft. 225-25-2.

No. Cm: 1072-25

Office of the Deputy Commissioner,
Hassan District,
Dated Hassan the 21st January 1926.

From

R. Nanasamy Rao, Esquire.,
Deputy Commissioner, Hassan Dist.

GEN. & REV. SECRETARIAT
23 JAN 1926
INDUSTRIES & COMMERCE
BRANCH.

Immediate

GENL. & REV. SECTT.
Bg. 9-C
23 JAN. 1926
R. & A. SECTION.

B. Srinivasa Iyengar, Esq., B.A., BL.,
Secretary to Government,
Revenue Department,
B a n g a l o r e.

D 3751 9-C.

S i r,

I have the honor to invite kind reference to my letter No. 623-16 dated 6th January 1926 forwarding for approval a draft written statement to be filed in the District Judge's Court, Mysore in the suit instituted by one Rajagopalsetty of Hassan claiming possession of two bungalows near Sandalkoti, Hassan, purchased by Government for arrears of sandal dues by Mr. Gundasetti and to request that it may kindly be returned early.

I have the honor to be,
S i r,
Your most obedient servant,
Deputy Commissioner,
Hassan District.

Subd. This case was sent to the L. d. Secy on 11-1-26. This may now be sent there
23.1.26

As/2.

To L. d. Secy with compliments for perusal & early return with opinion

25.1.26

The Written Statement has been returned by the Public Prosecutor, duly approved
25.1.26 L. d. Secy

Law 30/1

Reply 30/1

3751

A verbatim has been sent
to the Dr. Hague (Vide
Limited list)

IMD
3.2.26
Rec. from Sir
and Comps

Dr. Pensax

169/26 (Mr. enclosed) 4/2/26

5/2

6/2

GEN. & REV. SECRETARIAT
6 - FEB 1926
INDUSTRIES & COMMERCE
BRANCH.

O. I No 6/25.26 (Re Rajasthal. Affy
Dft. Nuron
Dy. Comrs Hansi

[App. F. III 2

General and Revenue Secretariat

Head File No. 23/4975 of 1927.

Serial No	
1	From the Dy. Hissar No C. No 10724 G. 23.2.26. Requesting approval to a revised written statement said to have been drafted by the Public Prosecutor, Nuron In his letter G. 23.1.26, the Public Prosecutor represented that as per the records the Revenue authorities had passed an order of forfeiture, which it is now reported by the Dy. that the order passed was one of attachment & not forfeiture. The P. P. should have made some of his position clear & wrote definitely to Govt especially as the Dy had known a draft as he (the P. P.) was asked to verify the statements with reference to the records. Draft to D.C. is put up Nuron 24.2.26 app 8.4. 2.6/2 To The Dy Comr Hissar Nuron 4175 Dy 26/2 Returns the graph.
2	

B Dft 8/4/26 Dr B

NOTE—Contn. Sheet

No.623-16/Mis. Office of the Deputy Commissioner,

Hassan District,

Dated Hassan, the 4th December 1925.

23086
GEN. SECRETARIAT
7 DEC 1925
INDUSTRIES & COMMERCE
BRANCH.

6. DEC. 1925

DIARY NO. 29-8-1
19 — 22
Section 21-
File No. 225-28
Serial No. 1

R. Nanasamy Rao, Esquire,

Deputy Commissioner, Hassan District.

To

B. Srinivasa Iyengar, Esq., B.A.,B.L.,

Secretary to Government, Revenue Department,

Bangalore.

Sir,

Adverting to correspondence ending with my letter No.623-16 dated 2nd September 1925 reporting that the claim of Mr.H.C. Rajagopala Setty of Hassan to 7/9th share in the two Bungalows near Sandal Koti at Hassan was rejected on the miscellaneous side on the ground that it should form the subject matter of regular suit, I have the honor to state that the said Rajagopalasetty has filed a suit in the District Judge's Court, Mysore for possession of the said properties as also for the proportionate rent due thereon which remains still unpaid by the tenants. As the right, title and interest of Gundasetty in these houses were purchased by Government in 1920 and as the claim of Government to these houses is being urged, the Deputy Commissioner has been made one of the Defendants in the suit. The summons received from the District Court, Mysore, has been returned after service and I have requested the Public Prosecutor to defend the suit on behalf of Government. A copy of the plaint received is herewith forwarded. The Plaint has been forwarded to the Public Prosecutor in original. I request that you will be so good as to instruct the Public Prosecutor to defend the suit in the District Judge's Court Mysore. On hearing from him I shall address you again in the matter.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

Abdulrahman

for Deputy Commissioner,
(Absent from Station)
Hassan District.

V

మైసూరు డిస్ట్రిక్ట్ ఓరియంటల్ లిటరరీ మీటింగ్-

1925-26 సెషన్ లో పఠించిన వ్యాసాల పేర్లు 6

పాఠి N.S రాసి ఇచ్చిన వ్యాసాల పేర్లు

ప్రతి పాఠిగళు 1) గుబ్బి వీరన్న 2) మండ్య వీరన్న కిరిందే
శంగ వీరన్న 4) కిందపు క్రిష్ణ వీరన్న 5)
తరగ వీరన్న 6) శ్రీ రంగ వీరన్న 7)
హిరేమందరాంబ 6, 7 వ్రతి పాఠిగళు
మైసూరు గిరియ మైసూరాంశగళు 8) రంగీవంత
ధైర్యవంత అంచు ఇచ్చిన వర 9) మైసూరాంత
గళ్ళరు 10) కాళిదాస దడ్డిక్షు రచ్చే తిరుమల
ఐయంగార్ ఇచ్చిన వర 11) మిస్ N.G. లక్ష్మీ
నరసింహాచార్ 12) మిస్ N.S సంబుంధి
ఇచ్చిన వరు 13) మిస్ N. క్రిష్ణ ఇచ్చిన వరందీ
14) కాళిదాస దడ్డిగళ తరిత్రె మైసూరిన
వరు -

పాఠి పేళువ్రదేశిందరి.

1.2 నేత్రతి పాఠిగళు మత్తే 4 నేత్రతి పాఠి కెందీ శంకరాచార్య
గళ్ళరు ఎంబువరు అందాజేయ్యంది ఎంబ విషయ బుంచు పేళువ
లు మత్తే హేరిదవరు ఎంబ విషయం ఇదు మత్తే 4 నేత్రతి పాఠి తెందీయ
ద శంకరాచార్యరు గళ్ళరు ఈ మైసూరు మంరు ఎంబరుష్టద తరిగళ 4 నే
త్రతి పాఠి ఇవుగళన్ను ఒట్టిగె కాలవాగిలు మత్తే శ్రీ. మిల్లంతే 1.2 నేత్ర
తి పాఠిగళు 4 నేత్రతి పాఠి కెందీ శంకరాచార్యరు ఎంబ
ంబుగళు నిందలూ నడెదుబుందు ఇరతర్పన్నిగె పాఠ Family-
trade, వన్నిగె శిల్పగళన్ను నడెసికొండు బరదవన్నిగె రత్న
ఆచార్య గళన్ను పాఠిసిగళు మత్తే రిని నేత్రతి పాఠిగళు

2 నేత్రతి పాఠిగళ తరవాగిరుత్తే 5 నేత్రతి పాఠిగళు 1 నే
త్రతి పాఠిగళ తరవాగిరుం 6.7 నేత్రతి పాఠిగళు 1 నేత్రతి
పాఠిగళ తరవాగిరుత్తే శంకరాచార్యరు మత్తే గళ్ళరు
10 ంద్ర రవరంగిన త్రతి పాఠిగళు ఒట్టిగె బుంబు తిళిదిరు

కాదిశర లాంఎర కర ఛిత్రీ కు కుంట్లి 778 నోసంఖ్యకు
7-4-25 నోకొత్త0 నోంఖీ కు అంత్రంగా రేంఛ్రీ రాత్రి నే.
శుద్ధి నోంఖీ జు 11.4.1925 రల్లు 10 నోత్ర శిశాంది ర ఛత్రీ నిగే
కాంది అయాంశిరుట్టే. తత్ర నోంఖీ నిగే జు సంఖ్యాంశి 10 నోత్ర
శిశాంది రకరకరు లు తోర్ఖాలేటు రకరతిశేవ 7-7-2 13.7.1925
రల్లు క్రీంది జు సాంఖ్యాంది లు తోర్ఖాలేటు రకరతిశే 15.7.1925
రల్లు కలంరుట్టే. శుద్ధి జు సాంఖ్యాంశిగే లాంఎర రత్నే ఉత్తి గాం.
అయు కా ధ్రీఛ్ఛ్ర ఎరోం ధ్రీ కాంశిరుట్టే.

13 నోత్ర శిశాంది లాంఎర ఛ్రీ తుంబ్ల నోంఖ్యనగళు కుత్ర రకాంశ్రీ
ఖంగ్లాదల్లు 7.1.1920 రలాంశాంఖ్యు 5.3.1923 రకరతిశే
అత్ర కుగ్లా ధ్రీ ఎనదల్లు కేలవ్వంద నోంతిశి న ఖాంతిగే రేంతకి
ఖిటుచ ఛ్రీంఎశిరు వ్యుదరింద ఇవర స్వగుర కాంకాంత్ర కాంఛ్రీ
కుంతి ఇవరకేలలీ రేళ్ళ ఖబుత్రు దాంద ఛుచ ఖాంతిగే కెన్నిగే
ఛ్రీ నఛ్ఛ్రీ వత్ర కుంత్ర లాంఎర స్వగుంశర్తిలాంఎరుట్టే. ఇదరంతే
1 నోత్ర శిశాంది ఎంఖుంఎరను తిర్ఖ్రీంఛ్రీ నదఖంఖ్లాదల్లు
15-2-1922 రలాంశాంఖ్యు 12.5.1925 రకరతిగే అత్ర కుగ్లా
ధ్రీ ఎనదల్లు దుద రేళ్ళంరు ఖాంతిగే నోంఖలగస్న కాంఎకికుం
రడేఇరు వ్యుదరింద లిఖిం దాంకాంత్ర ఇవర స్వగుం చెరియాం
గశేదిశి లాంఎర కేలలీ రేళ్ళ ఖబుత్రు దాంద రాఖనోఛ్ఛ నఛ్ఛ్రీ
త్ర ఇవన స్వగుంశరతిసిరుట్టే. ఇదరంతే 12 నోత్ర శి
శాంది ఎంఖుంఎరను 11 నోత్ర శి శాంది రు ఖి ఛ్ఛ్రీ లాంశిలిఖ్యు
అత్ర కుగ్లా ధ్రీ ఎనదల్లు దుద రేళ్ళంరు ఖాంతిగే నోంఖలగస్న
కాంశ్రీ కుంతిరకే లాంఎర కదరింద త్రగదాంకాత్ర ఇవర స్వగు
గాంఖ్యు లయాంగశేత్రిసి లాంఎర కదరింద 12.5.1925 ర
లాంశాంఖ్యు స్వగు ఖ్లాంగకాంగి స్వగు కాంది కాగ్లా ధ్రీ ఎనగా
గుకరతిగూ తొంఖకేలఖిరతిరు ఖాంతిగే నఛ్ఛ్రీ వత్ర కుత్ర
ఇవర మీలలీ దాంకాంరంది రుట్టే. 13 నోత్ర శిశాంది కాంక
కాంశిదు వత్ర కుగ్లా దాంశ్రీ దఖంఖ్లాంకస్న 10 నోత్ర శి శాంతిరు
14 నోత్ర శిశాంతిరు ఖాంఖనదకస్న్లలు గళ తోఖ్రుఖ్ర తిఖిన్
ఖోచ్ఛ్రీ కరకర ఛిత్రీ ఎనగే ఖాంతిగే రేంఛ్రీ ఇరు వ్యుదరింద

కీలల్లంధ 14 శాలివాహన వారసుల్ల ఈ దాంశాంశ్ భాంటిగ్
యుంగ శేరిన యిరుశ్కే

ఖాళీ చెక్ తారీఖు:- $\frac{22}{23}$-8-1919, 17-6-1918, 19-3-1920, 8-11-1920 25-1-1923, 11-6-1925 రల్లు ఈ రాండుయుద్ధ కారణ ముంచిన ఆంశనవల్లు వ్రుంచాగియిరుశ్కే

దాంశాంశ:- (A) ఎ శేరుల్లు మొంశ్కి నవల్లు $\frac{7}{8}$ ఖిస్సె సీరు ఫ్ల స్ల ఖ్రూంధలూ ఈ దాంశాకెందు యిరుశ్కే కీందు కీళి ఎ శేరుల్ల స్వాధ్యగళ్లు నవల్లు యుంవ తారణాంచిన వారలాంధరుం కీలల్లంధ ఖిస్సెయస్ల ఖ్రూంధలు అను భాగకెందు రాండు భాగవన్నాగిసి రంధు భాగవన్నాగిద్దవల్లు నేత్రి ఖిస్సె యుష్ట్ర భాగాలు వ రుపుంబుద యిరర ఆశ్రిగళ్లు ఖిస్సెయస్ల కాంచిగే రాండు భాగవన్నాగిసి రంధు భాగవన్నాగిద్దవల్లు ఈ దాంశాంతర లాంగిదే.

ఉదా:- కాంచియు ఎ శేరుల్ల మొంశ్కిగళ్లు $\frac{7}{8}$ ఖిస్సె రుప్ప స్ల ఖ్రూంధలు అను భాగకెందు రాండుగిన వరు శ్రీమతిల్లి తు వసంభ్రమ వ్రుభంధల్లు ఖిస్సెయుంటు భవయిరరల్లి శ్రీగళ రతిశీలుగళ్ల శ్రీమతి గళు రాండు భాగవాదుద్ధ రూపాయి అన్న ణంకి అవర్ని కాంచియు ఇద్ద ల్లి అందాజి మొంశ్కి శ్రీ దీవనదల్లి

5000-0-0

(B) భూతిశేరతిశీల్

11 మేత్రి శాంచిలు కాంచిలు 20.10.1922 రలాంశ్యు 12.5.1925 రంధు 2 రూపాయి 6 భాగగళు 22 చి రుప్ప రూంచియుంవ 17 రూపాయి యుంటుంశే. } 522-8-0

12 మేత్రి శాంచిలు 12-5-1925 రలాంశ్యు 20-10-25 రవరిగే 5 భాగగళు 8 చి రూపాయి రూంచిలు యుంవ 17 రూపాయి నంతే లెక్కగుదు } 89-8-0

13 మేత్రి శాంచిలు 20.11.1922 రింద 5.3.1923 రవరిగే 3 భాగగళు 8 చి రూపాయి రూపాయి యుంవ 18 రూపాయి యుంటే లెక్కగుదు } 63-0-0

10 నోత్ర శిపాందిలు కొందలు 5.3.1923 రూపాయలు
రుజు 20.10.1925 కంటే 2 కరుపు 7 సంగతు
15 దినకళ్ళ నూటయాభై 18 రూపాయలు 567-0-0

జుల్లు 1242-0-0

బిర్ధి కేంపుబుళ్ళ క్రాధ్రనే—

కేల్పుంత షేరుల్ల కోంత్రుగరు పాందియి స్థ కిచ్చేసే ఉన్న కొంత కొందలూ శ్రీరిత్రి నూరి సదరంకోంత్రన్న కేల్పరి నాన్న యూంపాంగి లూంత్ర రాశభూంగిసి పాంది శేసేం రభ్రదేం రెలూం కోందు కేల్పరి రాశినాంరెరదింద రోజు చిగినకరు అట్టుచ నుచ్చినది ఇచ్చేయాన్న అధ్రకథ ఇచ్చేయు ఇల్లు కేలరుచుచ్చిన భూగన న్న షేరుల్ల కోంత్రినల్లు శిభూంగి పిసేం రలు కూంత్రవల్లుకోండి కోండి బరుకనర్ష్టరల్లు తర్ప లేచ్చరుచ్చిన చిలి బాలుళ్ళం టూంబర ఇరెర లిచ్చి గభింద పాంది శేసేం రభ్రదేం రెలూం కేల్పుంత రిసేదకాల్పరాందల్లు రంత రూంరాభూంది శేకేంబలను అంద్రే 1242 రూపాయి గరన్న పాంది శేనచ్చరదకరిందు సేం రభ్రదేం రెలూం 11.12.13 నోత్ర శిపాందిరు గరు కవ్రి కోంబలంది నల్లు కేల్పుంత దాంకా 8 నోరాలం నళ్లు న్న కూంద్రి యిరుక చేల్రి నేంబలను భద్రి భద్రి యూంగి 10 నోత్ర శిపాందిర కాంగర జేంటి బ పాంబాంబర్త్రాగి కవ్రి నేంబలన్న పాందశేకాంత్రి నూం రలు బర్ధి రుంత లూపాంది రోంలచ్చర్ర రర్పన్న 10 నోత్ర శిపాంది రు నుల్లు ఈరిచిసినళ్లు ఛంబోన నూం రబుద్దు దాంద ఇరెర త్ర శిపాంది గరు పాంది శేసేం రభ్రదేం రెలూం నూల్లు దాంకా పాందిలు అంగాయిట్టు షేరుల్ల కోంత్రు పాంది పార్ధ్రది ల నాంగుకరిగి 10 నోత్ర శిపాందిరు నూంది యూంనాం 35 రూపాయినంకే నచ్చరన్న సేం రలు బళ్ళి రాంగు రంకీయూం 12 నోత్ర శిపాందిరు ఈ బ్రే త్రి నళ్లు. వర్ష్టి కా రాంశ్రేదద బంగ్లా అర్రకు పార్ధ్రది నదళ్లు యిరుకదరింద కవ్రియురు కేల్పుంత 10 నోత్ర శిపాందిరోంది గే 17 రూపాయి నంకే చూంది గే తెల్ల కేలబినచ్చరన్న దాంకా పాందిలు లూంపాంట్టు బ్రే త్రి నళ్లు శ్రీరిత్రి నాంగుకరిగి బేంబేజిరాంబదాంత్రాగి యిరు శ్రీ త్రి రింద లూం వర్ష్టి సేంబలిచినకరిగే రాంత్రి రోంబలిబర బుద్దుదాంద ఇరెర నరిదాంర గరన్న పాడుపాంది శేసేం రిని రోంది భద్రదేం రెలూం క్రాధ్రనే. దాంకాంబలో 6242 గే రన్న Slam

పాంజరాల రిద్ధి

షెడ్యూల్స్

పాన్ నంబర్ కాలమ్లో ఏ రకమైన వివరాలు ఇవ్వకూడదు. పూర్తి పేరు తండ్రి పేరు తో సహా కాలమ్లో రాసే వ్యక్తి పేరు తో సహా అదే పేజీ లో ఇవ్వాలి కాలమ్ లో రాసే దస్తీ నా తో సహా పూర్తి వివరాలు ఇవ్వాలి ఇవ్వకపోయినచో ఇవ్వని పేరు ముందు ఉన్న సీరియల్ నంబర్ 2135-2136 ఖాళీ అయినచో ఆ ముందు ఉన్న సీరియల్ నంబర్ 2502 నుండి 2507 వరకు

అనుకుంటాను.

Sd. G. Kasturi Rangachar

ఇంటర్ లోకేటర్ పేజీ

Copy"

Sabanavalam

for. Deputy commissioner,

Hassan District.

No. 623-16 Misc & Cue 23991

Office of the Deputy Commissioner,
Hassan District,
Dated Hassan, the 9th December 1925.

From

R. Nanasamy Rao, Esquire.,

Deputy Commissioner,

Hassan District.



To

B. Srinivasa Iyengar, Esquire., B. A., B. L.,

Secretary to Government,

Revenue Department,

B a n g a l o r e.

Subject: In the matter of the suit by one Rajagopalasetty of Hassan claiming possession of 7/9th share of two bungalows near Sandalkoti at Hassan.

Sir,

In continuation of my letter No. 623-16 dated 4th December 1925 regarding the above, I have the honour to forward herewith copy of letter No. 226 dated 7th Dec. 1925 from the Public Prosecutor Mysore stating that he would appear on the hearing date and do the needful. He states that a sum of Rs. 25/- is required for meeting the incidental charges such as vakalat and Batta and process to witnesses. As the expenditure has to be charged to the Forest Budget, sanction may kindly be accorded to the expenditure in question and the Conservator of Forests instructed to send the amount by Remittance Transfer Receipt to the Public Prosecutor. The Public Prosecutor has intimated that for want of time he would move the court for an adjournment of the case from the 14th December 1925 to some other date.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

R Nanasamy Rao

Deputy Commissioner,

Hassan District.

Letter No. 226/25-26 dated 7th December 1925 from the - - Public Prosecutor, Mysore Division to the Deputy Commissioner, Hassan District.

With reference to your office letter No. 623-16 dated 4th December 1925 forwarding for my information and necessary - - action the copy of the plaint filed by H. C. Rajagopalasetty and your reference to the Revenue Secretary re: the suit and requesting me to prepare the defence statement and send it to you early as the case is posted to the 14th December 1925, I have the honour to inform you that I shall appear on the - - hearing date and do the needful.

As the date of hearing is 14th December 1925 before which, it would not be possible to prepare our defence statement, an adjournment will be taken on the 14th.

In the meantime, I request that the Vakalat herewith sent may kindly be returned duly signed by you, with a sum of Rs.25/- to meet the incidental charges such as vakalat stamps and batta and process to witnesses.

Copy

Abdurrahman

for Deputy Commissioner, 10/12/25
Hassan District.

PVG/10-12.

G.R.S. VI G 34

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

, *the* *192*

Date of issue.... 16/12/25

Signed by.... Mr V. V. Char

May this be

i Printed ?

ii treated as a standing order ?

iii published in the Gazette, English Part ?

iv translated ?

v placed at the disposal of the press ?

vi published in the Gazette, Kannada Part ?

Section 21-

File No. 225-25

Serial No. 3

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore

Read— Letter no 623-16 or 4.12.1925, from the D.C. Hassan reporting that one Mr H.C. Rajagopala Setty has filed a Suit for 7/9th share in two bungalows of Mr Gunda Setty which have been bought by Govt in a revenue Sale ~~Order Thereon No.~~ for arrears due from Mr Gunda Setty to the Forest Dept and requesting Sanction to the public Prose

ector defending
the Suit on behalf
of the D.Le. Hassan
who is made a
defendant in the
Suit (O S 6 of 25-26)
on the file of the Mysore Munsif

Order 40-41-4

The Public Prosecutor
Mysore Dt is requested
to defend the Suit
on behalf of the
D.Le. Hassan ~~and to~~
~~represent him~~

8/12 — Rev. Secy

To The D.Le. Hassan
The learned G.P.
The Learned Govt
Pleader The Public Prosecutor
Mysore Dt.
8 12.25

Copied by

Examined by

WD 1886—GPE—1,000,00—21-12-21

APP. F. VI. Gl.]

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the 192

Date of issue 22/12/25

Signed by Mr V. V. Char

List of enclosures.....

Copied by.....

Examined by.....

Section 21

File No. 225-25

Seria No.

No. 4213

To The Court of J.M.

Sir

In continuation of my No D.B 4041-4 dt 225-25-3 dt 16.12.25 requesting the Public Prosecutor Mysore Dist to ~~defend the Suit~~ represent the W.C. Hassan in O.S No. 6 of 25-26 on the file of the Dist Judge Mysore filed by one Hole-Rayappa Shetty, I am directed to request you to advance a sum of Rs 25/- to the

over

public Prosecutor from the D.C. Hassan.
towards incidental
charges subject to
adjustment in due
course.

Thanks etc

19/12

19/12 Rev Secy

memo no DC/4214 8/22/12/25

Copy of the above
is forwarded to the D.C.
Hassan with ref^ce to
his letter no 623-16 misc

dy
19/12

Or Q-1.2.26 to D.P. impose
memo no Copy
~~DC/4215 8/22/12/25~~ - By order,

19/12 for Rev Secy

mss
17.12.25

3680
Enc. 1.

15th January

The Public Prosecutor,

Mysore Division

In returning herewith the draft Written Statement in O.S. No.6/25-26 on the file of the District Court, Mysore, received from the Deputy Commissioner, Hassan, I have the honour to invite your attention to the substitution of the word "attachment" for "forfeiture" in paragraph 3 of the statement and to request that the statement may be revised in the light of the above alteration and of the following remarks and the revised statement sent to me for scrutiny. If there was only an attachment by the Revenue authorities The following questions would arise. Firstly whether the Revenue authorities have power to attach the properties before sale of properties under Section 161 of the Land Revenue Code to realise the arrears due to the Forest Department and if they have no such power, what the effect of improper attachment will be and secondly what will be the effect of prior attachment by Revenue authorities before the judicial sale in execution of a decree. You may kindly consider these questions with reference to the records and revise the written statement suitably.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

Secretary to Government,
Local and Legislative Departments.

31670

3006
P 25

From

The Government pleader and Public Prosecutor, Mysore Dr — con
Mysore



To

The Secretary to the Government
of H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore
Local and Legislative Department
Bangalore

Dated 22/23-1-26
No 296/25-26.

Enclosure Draft written Statement in O.S. no 6/25-26 in Dist. Court

Sir, I have the honour to acknowledge
I receipt of your Communication no 3480
dated 15-1-26 with its enclosure, while
returning the draft written statement
you invite my attention to the substitution
of the word 'attachment' for 'forfeiture'
in para 3 of the statement and require
me to revise the statement in the light
of the above alteration. In answer to the
above, I beg leave to state that the above
alteration cannot be effected not merely
because it would be contrary to the
procedure adopted in the case of Inam
by the Revenue authorities but would
also be untenable under the provisions
of the Land Revenue Code. My reasons
for opening as above submitted are
these

The word 'attachment' under the
L.R. Code is used in a peculiar sense.

it is not used in the same sense as in the civil procedure code.

2 Under the L. R. Code there can only be distraint and no attachment of moveables Attachment of immoveable properties is contemplated in clause (f) of Section 156 L.R. Code. But this attachment is restricted to the case of alienated holdings consisting of entire villages or shares of villages the procedure to be adopted in such cases of attachment is detailed in Sections 165 to 169 of the L. R. Code.

3. There can be no attachment of an alienated holding or occupancy there cannot be a valid order of forfeiture either under Sections 54 55, 156 or 159 of the L.R. Code, unless and until there be an arrear of land revenue due from that land.

4. Neither Section 54, 55 nor Section 156 cl (b) nor 159 legalizes a forfeiture and sale of any other land but the occupancy or alienated holding in respect of which the arrear of land revenue is due (15 Bombay 67)

5. But if land is brought to sale for an arrear of land revenue or arrears recoverable as such under Sec. 193 L. R. code the procedure to be adopted is the same as is laid down in chapter XI of the L. R. Code.

6. Under the above circumstances an order of forfeiture would be out of place and in the case of sale, it [illegible] be one under Sec. 161. incum-

brances created by the occupant remain unaffected whereas they disappear in the case of a forfeiture under Sections 54 and 159. In short a sale under S. 171 is similar to a sale held by a civil court in execution of its decree

From the above it will be seen that the Revenue authorities, as per the records placed sometime back in my hands, passed an order of forfeiture (though not strictly legal) in respect of the said properties on 22-5-1918 and in March 1920 brought the said properties to sale, wherein the right, title and interest of Gundaselly was purchased by Government for one Rupee

Though an order of forfeiture passed in the case under reference does not 'ipso facto' free the occupa from encumbrances yet with a view to rely upon the provisions of Sec. 143 L.R. Code which gives priority to all Government claims I thought it more discreet to make mention of it than to omit it. The order of forfeiture in the case on hand, though it may not put an end to the pro-prietory interest of the occupant and free the holding from all encumbrances, yet it may signify that Government urged their claims against the said properties for recovery of money due to Government

It may be urged that Mylarisetty, though cognizant of such a claim, bought the interest of Gundasetty which he stated as being $\frac{1}{3}$ share in the suit properties, at the Court sale

For the reasons above submitted I do not feel called upon to alter the statement in the way suggested But I have added the last line in para 3 of the written statement herewith sent.

If you still think that the statement requires modification you will please do so and forward the same to the Deputy Commissioner Tasildar so that he may send the typed copies duly signed.

I have the honour to be
Sir
your most obedient Servant

Thomas Chapman

Govt. pleader and Public Prosecutor

In
the Court of the Dist. Judge. Mysore -

O.S. No 6 of 26-26

Dated

Plaint

H.C. Raja Venkatashetty ... 10th Dfdt and Hassan

The 10th defendant above named begs leave to file the following written statement -

1. That the 10th deft does not admit the allegations contained in para 1 of the plaint, regarding joint acquisition, but avers that the plaint scheduled properties are the self acquired & exclusive properties of Gundashetty - the 2nd Deft

2. That this defendant is not aware of the allegations made in para 2 of the plaint.

3. That in view of an agreement executed by Gundashetty on 4-10-1910: Govt became entitled to recover the dues rate to the Forest theft, under Sec. 79 of my, Forest Regulation, so before it. take in favour of Mysore Shetty, as stated in para 3 of the plaint, an order of forfeiture was passed on 22-5-1918 & subsequently that was in 1920 the right, title and interest of Gundashetty in the suit properties, was purchased by Government. Now by the alleged purchase from Mysore Shetty, referred to in para 3 of the plaint plaintiff has no title to the suit properties as Mysore Shetty was aware of the forfeiture & subsequently Gubbi Shetty - the 1st deft - & Venkata Krishnashetty - the 4th deft, have no manner of interest in the suit properties - Plaintiff by

OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER
15209
30 DEC. 1925
HASSAN

Dl not attachment

by reason of an alleged handing over of Subba Shetty & Venkata Krishna Shetty's interest in the suit land, leaving no title

Nor is defendant in entitled to recover the rental due from the several occupants of the plaint schedule land nor was any the plaintiffs' claim regarding recovery of possession of 1/9th share in the suit land along with the rental as detailed in the plaint is untenable.

The plaintiff is not entitled to any of the reliefs asked for in the plaint; as such, it is prayed that the suit may be dismissed with costs

Facts above submitted are true to the best of my knowledge & belief.

29th December 1925

Before

Mr. Lewis van Langenberg

Asst Member & J.P.

From

The Court Member of Public Accounts
Hupeh Div. Hsuan

To

The Security Commissioner.
Hsuan Chi District
Hsuan

Dated 29th December 1925

No 256 of 25-26. Cite Memo No 6 of 25-26 and file Kao Chi Hsuan

Sir,

I have the honour to forward herewith a draft of the written statement prepared by me in connection with the plaint filed by H. C. Peterson. The plaint copy is also sent for reference and return. The written statement may kindly be sent to Court for approval & after the same is received, three typed copies of the statement may kindly be sent to me. As usual Yamen clerk fees & the typed copies would be charged.

I have the honour to be
Sir
Your most obedient servant
The Assistant Magistrate
Court Member H.A.

16

26th Jan. 6

F 365-7 (1)

Kaur

The Public Prosecutor,

MYSORE.

In re: O.S.No.6/25-26 on the file of District Court, Mysore.

.....

With reference to your letter No.286/25-26 dated 23rd - - January 1926, I have the honour to state that in the circumstances explained in your letter, the Written Statement as drafted by you (copy of which is herein enclosed) may be adopted and filed.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

Secretary to Government,
Local and Legislative Departments.

F 365 8/one
of 26/1/26

Copy of the above is forwarded with compliments to the Deputy Commissioner, Hassan with a copy of the Written statement with reference to his letter No.623-11 dated 6th January 1926 and C.No.10 Ft./25 dated 21st January 1926 with the request that typed copies duly signed may be sent to the Public Prosecutor, Mysore Division for being filing in Court.

By order,

Secretary to Government,
Local and Legislative Departments

IN THE COURT OF THE DISTRICT JUDGE, MYSORE.

O.S.No.67 of 25-26.

Plaintiff.		Defendants.
H.C.Rajagopala Shetty.	vs	10th Deputy Commissioner, Hassan.

The 10th Defendant above named begs to file the following written statement in answer to the plaint.

I. That the 10th Defendant does not admit the allegations contained in para 1 of the plaint regarding joint acquisition, but avers that the plaint scheduled properties are the self-acquisition and exclusive properties of Gunda Shetty the 2nd defendant.

II. That this Defendant is not aware of the allegations made in para 2 of the plaint.

III. That by force of an agreement executed by Gunda Shetty on 4th October 1915, Government became entitled to recover the dues due to the Forest Department under Section 79 of the Forest Regulation. So before the sale in favour of Mylari Shetty as stated in para 3 of the plaint, an order of ~~attachment~~ forfeiture was ~~made~~ passed on 22nd May 1918 and subsequently that is in 1920 the right, title and interest of Gunda Shetty in the suit properties, was purchased by Government. Thus by the alleged purchase from Mylari Shetty referred to in para 3 of the plaint, plaintiff got no title to the suit properties as Mylari Shetty was aware of the forfeiture and sale proceedings.

IV. Subba Shetty the 1st Defendant and Venkatakrishna Shetty the 4th Defendant had no manner of proprietory interest in the suit properties. Plaintiff by reason of an alleged purchase of Subba Shetty's and Venkatakrishna Shetty's interest in the suit properties derives no title.

V. This defendant is entitled to recover all the rental due from the several occupants of the plaint scheduled properties and the plaintiffs claim regarding recovery of possession of 7/9th share in the suit properties along with the rental as detailed in the plaint is untenable.

VI. The plaintiff is not entitled to any of the reliefs asked for in the plaint; and as such, it is prayed that the suit may be dismissed with costs.

Facts above submitted are true to the best of my knowledge and belief.

January 1926.

Mysore.

Law

3575 Immediate

3364 P 25

16

Office of the Deputy Commissioner,
Hassan District,
Dated Hassan, the 23rd February 1926.

No. C No: 1072-26

C. Secn.

Law 25-2-26





From

R. Nanasamy Rao, Esquire.,

Deputy Commissioner, Hassan District.

To

B. Nagappa, Esq., Bar-at-law.,

Secretary to Government,

Local and Legislative Departments,

B a n g a l o r e.

Law 24/

S i r,

S u b j e c t:-

Written statement in O.S. No.6 Rajagopalasetty Vs. Deputy Commissioner Hassan on the file of the District Judge, Mysore.

Referring to your Memo No. P.3658/Law dated 26th January 1926 returning duly approved the written statement prepared by the Public Prosecutor in the above suit, I have the honor to state that on an examination of the original records relating to the sale of the right, title and interest of Mr.Gundasetty in the house properties at Hassan it was found that no order of forfeiture was passed by any Revenue Officer of Government but that the then Deputy Commissioner, Mr. Venkata Rao directed on 30th June 1917 the attachment and sale of the right, title and interest of Mr. Gundasetty presumbly under Section 161 Land Revenue Code including the suit properties. In accordance with this order an attachment was duly effected by the Shekdar on 22nd May 1918 and a sale isthihar issued on 30th October 1919 and the sale held on 5th and 6th March 1920. On my writing to the Public Prosecutor about the details of procedure adopted prior to the holding of the sale and of the fact that the order of attachment did not appear to be supported by any provision of the Land Revenue Code he has in reply (copy enclosed) sent back the written statement revising para III in the light of the above facts.

The revised statement which is herein enclosed may kindly be approved and forwarded to me so as to reach this office on the 28th instant as the statement has to be filed in the Court on the 2nd March 26'.

I have the honor to be,

S i r,

Your most obedient servant,

Deputy Commissioner, absent from Hassan District.

AS/23-2.

From

The Public Prosecutor and
Government Pleader,
Mysore Division. Mysore.

To

The Deputy Commissioner,
Hassan District, Hassan.

Dated. 20th February 1926.

No. 545/25-26.

Enclosure. Amended draft written statement in O.S.No.6/25-26 in the District Judge's Court, Mysore.

Sir,

I have the honour to acknowledge receipt of your communication No. 1072/25 dated 16th February 1926 regarding the written statement that has to be filed in O.S.No.6/25-26 on the file of the District Judge's Court Mysore (H.C.Rajagopalasettys Deputy Commissioner, Hassan and others).

In your communication under reply you make mention of a sale -- Isthihar' or proclamation intending thereby that I should give prominence to this circumstance to enable Government to claim precedence. You are further pleased to observe that the issue of a sale 'Isthihar' or proclamation tantamounts to an attachment. In the light of this observation, you request me to revise para III, of the draft written statement sent to you. This contention of yours would have been of some avail if the said 'Isthihar' was prior in date to the court sale in favour of Aylari Setty. Though the then Deputy Commissioner, Mr. C. Venkata Rao directed the attachment and sale of the right, title and interest of Gundasetty, in his properties including the suit property on 30-6-1917, yet this was only given effect to by means of a sale proclamation on 30-10-1919. This was the earliest date on which the first sale proclamation was issued though there were two other proclamations which resulted ultimately in the sale of the suit property along with others on 5th and 6th of March 1920. This 'Isthihar' or sale proclamation does not help us even in the slightest degree, even if we contend that it tantamounts to an attachment, as Aylari Setty's purchase of Gundasetty's 1/3rd interest in the suit properties was on 17-6-1918.

Apart from the legality or otherwise of an order of attachment, I am inclined to rely upon the then Deputy Commissioner's order No.683 dated --

dated 30-6-1917 wherein he directed attachment of Gumasetty's property for recovery of sandal dues and in obedience to the said directions, attachment was duly effected on 22-5-1918. This incident, if relied, would enable us to urge that our intent to proceed against suit property for recovery of Government dues was ~~mxxx~~ manifested by an overt act which was prior in date to the court sale in favour of Mylari Setty.

Accordingly I have thought fit to amend para III of the written statement and send the same to your for acceptance and promptreturn the case is posted to 2-3-1926 for filing our defence. Though I have amended para III of the written statement, yet I am constrained to say as I have already done in my communication to the learned Local and Legislative Secretary that our contention may not after all be legally sound and sustainable.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

Sd. M. Srinivasa Iyengar

Public Prosecutor and Government Pleader, Mysore.

P. S. The written statement signed by you and containing my amendment is herewith sent for your reference. The amended written statement may kindly be typed in triplicate and sent to me with your signature, after the same is approved by Government.

Sd. M. Srinivasa Iyengar
20-2-1926.

Copy:

Sabhenmalam
23/2/26

Deputy Commissioner,
Hassan District.

pvg

APP. F. VI. Gl.]

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Section Law

File No. 73-27

Seria No. 2

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

No. 4125 Law

To The D.C. Kegalle

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *192*

Sir,

Date of issue 26/2

Signed by Mr Wagappa

With reference to your letter No C 20 1072. 25 & 23 2. 26 re A.S No 6 of 25 26 on the file of the D.C. Kegalle, I am to state that I have no objection to the alteration made by the Public Servants in the Written Statement in Mak Case under the circumstances explained in your

List of enclosures.....

Copied by.....

Examined by.....

over